

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 20 2006

REMARKS

An Office Action was mailed on May 18, 2006, and declared final.

Claims 1-20 are pending, of which claims, 1, 6, 10, and 14 are independent claims.

By the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 14, and 16-18 are amended, claim 4 is cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10-13 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for lacking antecedent basis for "the metal plate." Claim 10 has been now amended to recite "a metal plate." Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and/or 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, and 4-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 09-201134 (JP '134). Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10-14, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 07-054132 (JP '132)

Reconsideration of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested.

All independent claims recite that an atomic ratio of "Ti/In in a range from 0.003 to 0.019." JP '134 does not teach, disclose, or suggest this limitation. The Examiner maintains that Examples 11 and 17 disclose atomic ratios as claimed. At issue appears to be Table 2 of JP '134 (reproduced below).

10/694,704

	Ex	Ti (at%)	In (at%)	Ratio Ti/In
EXAMPLE 1	1	85.0	17.0	0.2048
EXAMPLE 2	2	82.5	17.5	0.2121
EXAMPLE 3	3	82.6	17.4	0.2107
EXAMPLE 4	4	82.9	17.1	0.2063
EXAMPLE 5	5	83.1	16.9	0.2034
EXAMPLE 6	6	82.3	17.7	0.2151
EXAMPLE 7	7	82.8	17.2	0.2077
EXAMPLE 8	8	82.3	17.7	0.2151
EXAMPLE 9	9	82.5	17.5	0.2121
EXAMPLE 10	10	83.0	17.0	0.2048
EXAMPLE 11	11	97.6	2.4	0.0246
EXAMPLE 12	12	61.5	38.5	0.6260
EXAMPLE 13	13	62.2	17.8	0.2165
EXAMPLE 14	14	82.9	17.1	0.2063
EXAMPLE 15	15	83.0	17.0	0.2048
EXAMPLE 16	16	83.0	17.0	0.2048
EXAMPLE 17	17	80.0	11.2	0.1400
COMPARATIVE EXAMPLE 1	C 1	83.0	17.0	0.2048
COMPARATIVE EXAMPLE 2	C 2	83.0	17.0	0.2048
COMPARATIVE EXAMPLE 3	C 3	98.8	1.2	0.0121
COMPARATIVE EXAMPLE 4	C 4	50.2	49.8	0.9920

In the prior response, Applicant amended the previous claims, i.e., claims as originally filed the claims, because these claims were within the ratio disclosed by JP '134. However, the presently claimed range, is not disclosed by JP '134. Applicant provides the above table calculating the atomic ratio of Ti/In for each of the Examples and Comparative Examples.

Thereto, Examples 11 and 17 disclose atomic ratio of 0.0246 and 0.1400, respectively. Other ratios are even greater. In contrast, the claimed ratio is from 0.003 to 0.019. Thus, even Example 11, at 0.0246 is larger by approximately a factor of 10 than the bottom of the claimed range, 0.003. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections with respect to JP '134.

All independent claims no recite that the oxide sintered body comprises "tin as an impurity" and that the "tin as an impurity is in an amount such that the atomic ratio of Sn/In is 0.0025 or less." JP '132 does not teach, disclose, or suggest this limitation.

JP '132 discloses only an indium tin oxide (ITO) film made from indium-oxide and tin-oxide powder. Paragraphs 0002, 0003. Therein, the amount of tin relative to indium is significantly

higher than presently claimed. As disclosed at paragraph 0012, tin comprises 1 part in 20 parts, or more preferable 1 part in 15 parts, by percent of weight.

Thus, even when tin comprises an impurity in the presently claimed invention, the amount of time is far less than that which is inherently present in an ITO film and certainly not as claimed an amount such that the atomic ratio of Sn/In is 0.0025 or less. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection in view of JP '132.

JP '134 does not fill the gap of JP '132, since JP '134 also teaches an ITO sputtering target having a concentration of tin. See for example paragraph 0014.

For the individual reasons detailed above and for the cumulative of the above reasons, which Applicant respectfully submits would not lead one skilled in the art to arrive at the presently claimed invention

All dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend.

The application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper, including any extension fees, may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Hassan A. Shakir  
Reg. No. 53,922  
(212) 940.6489

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304**  
DOCKET NO.: KAM 20.716 (100799-00087)

10/694,704